

REMARKS

Claims 16-97 are withdrawn. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Restriction Requirement

The claims are subjected to a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121 as allegedly containing nine distinct inventions:

- I. Claims 1-15, "drawn to a process wherein a network location acts to coordinate availability, retrieval, or execution of resources associated with that location, classified in class 715, subclass 742."
- II. Claims 16-27, "drawn to a process of customizing multiple diverse workspace objects, classified in class 715, subclass 765."
- III. Claims 28-38, "drawn to a process comprising interactive multicomputer data transfer, classified in class 715, subclass 748."
- IV. Claims 39-47, "drawn to a method comprising on-screen controls, classified in class 715, subclass 851."
- V. Claims 48-55, "drawn to a process wherein distinct interface elements may be manipulated, classified in class 715, subclass 765."
- VI. Claims 56-59, "drawn to a process wherein a user has interactive access to distributed information or functions made available through a certain given user site classified in class 715, subclass 738."
- VII. Claims 60-76 and 96-97, "drawn to a process wherein the user interface is capable of establishing, modifying, or observing the

function of processes enabled by one or more of the plural sites, classified in class 715, subclass 743.”

VIII. Claims 77-84, “drawn to a method wherein portions of video material are arranged into a different order than that in which it was originally arranged, classified in class 715, subclass 723.”

IX. Claims 85-95, “a method wherein access control or permission, classified in class 715, subclass 740.”

To justify its rejection, the Office relies on MPEP 806.05(h) and argues that “[t]he inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product.” The Office then identifies two general groupings of claims (I-III, V-VII) and (IV, VIII and IX) and argues that these two groupings are distinctive under MPEP 806.05(h). However, The Office does not explain or argue why each of the identified groups (I-IX) within these two general groupings is distinctive. Instead, the Office merely concludes “[b]ecause these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes is indicated as proper.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not met its burden of making a prima facie showing (with respect to identified groups I-IX)

by providing an "appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search..." as required under MPEP 803.

Election

In the event that the election requirement is maintained, Applicant elects with traverse to prosecute claims 1-15 (Group I). Accordingly, Claims 16-97 are withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application.

Date:

3/26/07

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Richard Bucher
Reg. No. 57,971
(509) 324-9256